OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.				IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ED 035 787				ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
CH ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE	LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐
AA 000 490		Feb 70	RIEJUN70	

AUTHOR
Monlouis, Wilma D.

TITLE
Higher Education Opportunities for High-Risk Disadvantaged Students: A Review of the Literature.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
BBB01751	ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY
RMQ66000	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25;0.30		
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO.

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE 4p.; Paper appearing in Currents '70; n1 Feb 1970

DESCRIPTORS
*Higher Education; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Students; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Programs; Financial Support

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
The programs described in the documents chosen for this review might provide some answers for colleges and universities interested in establishing, or already conducting, programs for high-risk disadvantaged students. The success of these programs indicates that institutions are able to extend their educational services to high-risk students and maintain or raise their academic standards. The review describes pre-college preparatory programs, college and university programs, graduate programs, and methods of obtaining financial support for recruiting disadvantaged students and establishing viable compensatory programs. Information consistently lacking in the literature is identified. Most of the reports cited are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. (JS)

GPO 870-39C

AA 000 490

currents '70

from the ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 1, February

HIGHER EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR HIGH-RISK DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Traditionally, US institutions of higher education served an elite minority. After World War II, however, college and university enrollments rose dramatically as men and women sought to earn the degrees that became necessary prerequisites to employment and economic security. The institutions adjusted well to the demands of larger, more diverse student populations.

Today some colleges and universities are vigorously recruiting financially limited but talented students. But considerably fewer efforts are being made to attract socially and economically disadvantaged youngsters who, by traditional predictive criteria, are also academic risks. In a report[1] of a survey of 215 selected white institutions, John Egerton cites some of the commonly given reasons for limited involvement in enrolling underachieving minority group students:

> lack of funds, enrollment pressures, political worries, conflict with the institutional mission, fear of lowering institutional standards, lack of faculty support, inflexibility of the institution's system, and priority commitment to regular students.

The willingness of some institutions to enroll these high-risk students tends to be offset by scant knowledge about the specific techniques to be used.

The programs described in the documents chosen for this review might provide some answers for colleges and universities that have not yet established programs for recruiting or teaching disadvantaged, high-risk students. Those institutions that are already conducting such programs may be interested in similar activities and related data. The programs cited here reveal how some colleges and universities are able to extend their services to high-risk students and maintain or raise their institutional standards. All but one of the documents cited appear in ERIC's monthly journal of abstracts, *Research in Education*, and are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

ED 035 787

Pre-College Programs

The recruitment of disadvantaged high-risk students tends to conflict with recent trends toward higher admission standards, since it usually requires modification of some admissions criteria. Edmund Gordon and Doxey Wilkerson[2] estimate that the widespread adoption of one approach to this problem—preparatory summer programs—reached a peak in the summer of 1964, when many institutions throughout the country began to prepare inner-city high school students for college through in-depth compensatory education programs. The College Discovery Program, an example of this type of activity, began in the summer of 1964 when 234 high school graduates entered the Bronx and Queensboro Community Colleges as special matriculants to take remedial courses in reading, speech, mathematics, languages, and sciences. The program, jointly planned and operated by the City University of New York (CUNY) and the New York City Board of Education, guaranteed Fall admission to CUNY to all students who successfully completed the courses. Plans during this period were to enroll a total of 500 students within five years. Freedman and Mayers[3] report that in 1965 there were already 550 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students taking special courses in the College Discovery Program at five development centers in public high schools, one in each borough of New York. In the Fall of 1968, 273 of these students entered degree-granting units of CUNY and 55 entered private and state colleges on substantial scholarships. The academic program now focuses on English, social studies, languages, mathematics, and science, but varies at each center according to the particular needs of the students involved. Other services include tutoring by college students, counseling, and meetings with the students' parents. Admission to the program is based on factors such as evidence of financial need, underachievement, demonstrated aptitude in certain areas, and recommendations from high school teachers. Financial support for the program is provided by the New York City Board of Education (under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965), and the City University of New York.

Another pre-college preparatory activity that Gordon and Wilkerson mention is a program for students *below* the high school level. Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey began this project during the summer of 1964 for an interracial group of 50 disadvantaged seventh grade pupils who were chosen from nearby schools. The students return each summer until they are ready for college. Rutgers plans to increase the number of students until 200 are enrolled in the program.

An example of a large-scale pre-college preparatory activity is the New York City Board of Education's College Bound Program[4] established in 1967 to prepare students from poverty areas for eventual college entrance. By 1968, 6,000 college-bound students at 26 high schools had received special tutorial assistance and individual and group guidance. Some youngsters

participated in cultural activities and visited college campuses for pre-admission counseling. Teachers and other personnel at each high school are involved in the year-long program. The first class will be ready for admission to college in the fall of 1970. Member institutions of the New York College Bound Corporation, a consortium of northeastern colleges and universities, will admit all successful graduates of the College Bound Program and provide them with financial aid, supplementary counseling and/or special instruction when necessary.

An informative publication of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools[5] describes special programs and policies devised by 156 colleges and universities to meet particular needs of disadvantaged students at the pre-college level. The colleges are located in Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The booklet provides data on the identification of students with college potential from disadvantaged backgrounds, and on their transition from high school to post-secondary educational levels.

College and University Programs

In Egerton's study, which aimed to discover what some of the predominantly white, four-year colleges and universities are doing to make higher education available to high-risk students, outstanding programs of 12 public and seven private institutions are examined. Of the 162 responding institutions, 86 were involved in some form of high-risk activity, but only 20 to 25 had drawn extensively from the many available resources to establish meaningful programs. Most of the programs involve special recruiting, modified admissions criteria, and financial aid. The students take non-credit remedial courses in a curriculum that is usually tailored to their educational needs, and the institutions provide special counseling, guidance, and other services.

Questioning the effectiveness of special programs in altering the achievement patterns of disadvantaged students, Robert Wiliams[6] concedes that program results has so far elicited some optimism, but feels that it is too early to know what the full impact of high-risk programs are on students' attitudes toward themselves, their future vocational success, or their contribution to society. Certain discrepancies between the variety of approaches to compensatory programs lead Williams to conclude that: (1) the educational deficiencies of high-risk students should not be concealed from them as later discovery of their true academic status may cause hostility and reduce their motivation; (2) compensatory programs would be more effective if high-risk students were taught and housed with regular students, provided with sufficient funds to purchase clothing and engage in social activities on campus, trained in money management, and allowed to earn part of their support; (3) the relationship between instructors and high-risk students needs to be more personal, and (4) counseling should be voluntary rather than mandatory.

In his five-part review of the literature on socially disadvantaged youths, Edmund Gordon[7] notes that high school academic averages combined with teacher estimates are equal to, or better than, test scores in predicting college achievement. Financial aid to high-risk students is usually associated with compensatory practices and job assignments. But financial aid policies that saddle these students with the burdens of loan and job obligations impose additional hardships on them. Since they must work harder to earn acceptable grades, they should be allowed to devote most of their time and effort to studying.

Many disadvantaged Negro students enter compensatory programs in northern colleges with records no better or worse than those of other students and perform unsatisfactorily even though some concern for their adjustment to college life is evident. Gordon concedes that this concern is often warranted, but considers more important the adjustment of the institution to the demands of integrated education. These demands involve not only compensatory education programs but also recognition of the students' aspirations, motivations, resources, and achievement. Gordon found little evidence to support the popular belief that remedial programs alone improve academic performance. Similarly, Albert Whiting[8] proposes the revision of some current university techniques. He suggests a complete departure from the pattern of non-credit remedial courses to one of "fresh curricular experiences that stimulate receptivity," outright grants rather than work or loan study packages, a broad program of guidance and direction that covers both personality and behavioral problems, and a college environment which precludes stigmatizing identifications. Whiting also recommends open recruiting and enrolling of poor high-risk candidates, systematic evaluation of current remedial programs, and creative university efforts to produce the kinds of teachers needed to work with the disadvantaged at the secondary level.

The comprehensive data currently being collected on college-level compensatory programs for disadvantaged students by Edmund Gordon and Charles Thomas[9] from approximately 3,000 US institutions may provide some more answers to the questions being asked by university administrators. The survey is designed to gather facts about the status of compensatory programs at all four-year colleges, community colleges, and universities. A second objective of this study is an assessment of the effectiveness of these programs in terms of their influence on the personal, social, and academic adjustments of the students and how they have affected institutional attitudes and practices. Using the findings of this study, Gordon and Thomas hope to structure a model that will facilitate the identification of college potential in disadvantaged youth.

Graduate Programs

Howard Lawrence[10] presents an appraisal of four experimental graduate programs for disadvantaged Negro and other minority group students. The programs were initiated in 1966, with funds from the Danforth Foundation, at the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Cincinnati, Vanderbilt University and the University of Wisconsin. The universities were to identify and develop the talents of minority students whose social, economic and educational backgrounds placed them at a disadvantage in the competition for graduate study. Howard estimated in 1968 that a total of 1,200 to 1,500 Negroes in the US had received PhDs, which is approximately the number of degrees awarded annually to white students. Pointing out the need to increase the supply of black PhD holders, Howard discusses the ideologies underlying graduate programs for the disadvantaged at white universities and suggests that current approaches be changed from one of white orientation to one which utilizes the black experience as an educational resource. Graduate programs should, for instance, include the study of black history and culture; and, to balance the traditional emphasis on Western Europe, should also focus on Latin America, Africa and Asia.

An effective way to train teachers and administrators who are qualified for appointment at white institutions but who are also needed to strengthen Negro institutions is described by

Harold Stahmer[11] . The Harvard-Yale-Columbia Intensive Summer Studies Program (ISSP) began in 1965 to prepare disadvantaged college graduates from predominantly black and selected southern white colleges for graduate study in the arts and sciences, law, medicine, and other fields. The program, which provides eight weeks of intensive post-baccalaureate training, was modified in 1968 to include juniors and seniors, and to provide an eight-week faculty audit program for Negro college professors wishing to strengthen their educational and teaching abilities. ISSP, funded by the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation, provides $2,000 per student per summer. Stahmer notes that funds will be provided under the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students' section of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 to establish similar programs. It is possible that these funds may be available in 1970.

Another approach to graduate study for educationally disadvantaged students is the "buddy-schools" arrangement between predominantly white and southern Negro institutions. It provides a fifth-year program at the white institution for graduates of the Negro institution who need added preparation for graduate or professional studies. Gordon and Wilkerson[12] note that this type of agreement exists between Brown University (R.I.) and Tougaloo College (Miss.), Indiana University and Stillman College (Ala.), the University of Michigan and Tuskegee Institute (Ala.), Florida State University and Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Cornell University (N.Y.) and Hampton Institute (Va.), the University of Tennessee and Knoxville College (Tenn.), the University of North Carolina and North Carolina College at Durham, and the University of Wisconsin and Texas Southern University.

An analysis of master's and doctoral degree programs offered between 1963 and 1968 at the University of California, Los Angeles, for disadvantaged black, Mexican American and American Indian students is presented by Donald Carlisle[13]. These programs permit students to choose disciplines in the physical, life and social sciences, the arts and humanities, and applied or professional fields that lead to master's or doctoral degrees.

Funding

The lack of financial resources–or of knowledge about how to obtain them–presents the major obstacle for most institutions that may wish to institute special compensatory programs. Traditional sources of financial support for such special activities are the foundations (notably Rockefeller, Carnegie, Ford, and Danforth), industrial firms, service organizations, civic clubs, and alumni groups. Preston Valien[14] describes federal developments which provide the tools to make a real breakthrough in creating comprehensive, equal opportunity programs. In 1965, the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) created the Educational Talent Search Program as a supplement to the Upward Bound program to help the poor but potentially college-able youngster. USOE also administers the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), Student Loan, College Work-Study, Educational Opportunity Grants, and Guaranteed Loan Programs. Under the Educational Professions Development Act, college faculty and administrators may be trained to handle the problems of recruiting and retaining disadvantaged students. The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 provide for a new program of special supportive services for disadvantaged students who have been admitted to college, and link it with the Upward Bound and Talent Search Programs.

Ivan Hinderaker[15] describes how one kind of federally funded compensatory program might work. At the University of California, Riverside, disadvantaged students–particularly those from minority groups–are provided with financial help, special counseling, and tutorial assistance in an Educational Opportunity Program (EOP). Under the EOP, grants of $1,900 are awarded for each of a student's first two years. Each grant starts with a contribution of $165 raised by the campus, which is matched five-to-one from special funds of the Board of Regents. The federal government supplies the rest. After the sophomore year, EOP students work part-time to earn one-half of their needs, thus making more money available for additional grants. The number of EOP students grew from five in 1966 to eighty in 1969. An EOP graduate fellowship program is scheduled to begin in 1970. As Valien points out, recent federal developments provide almost endless opportunities for creative cooperation at the local level.

Conclusion

The sluggish response of many white institutions to the educational plight of poor minority youth can be partly attributed to lack of knowledge concerning the techniques required to conduct meaningful compensatory programs. The need for higher education among racial and ethnic minorities in the US equals that of the rest of the population, but high-risk programs in colleges and universities are serving only very small numbers of students from these segments of society.

The greatest efforts in compensatory higher education are those made by Negro institutions. They have struggled longest with the problem but are unable to cope with it because of its dimensions and their own insufficient resources. The fact that many white institutions seem to recruit and admit disadvantaged students who are most likely to succeed and exclude those who are academic risks also penalizes the weaker Negro institutions by leaving them with very few students who could raise their institutional standards.

In general, the efforts of white US colleges and universities are promising but not comprehensive enough. The experience of many programs in white institutions has been that students considered by the institution to be high risks defy pessimistic predictions and perform as well as other students. Higher education needs to be made accessible to deprived and low-achieving youngsters, but opportunities for them will be available only when the leading institutions decide to accept the challenge of developing the academic potential of the poor minorities. According to John Egerton:

> For the student with little or no money and a so-so record from an inferior high school, the odds against survival are high. And if, in addition, the student's skin is black, or red, or if his native tongue is Spanish, the high hurdles of higher education are almost insurmountable.

Much more information than that contained in the cited documents is needed. This Clearinghouse would welcome two copies of any reports providing additional data on workable high-risk programs. Please try to send documents that are legible enough for clear hard copy reproduction so that we can make them available to the academic community through the ERIC system. Information that is consistently lacking in reports includes descriptions of:

1. compensatory or other programs designed to include large numbers of disadvantaged whites, American Indians, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and Asians;
2. ongoing or completed evaluations of compensatory programs for high-risk disadvantaged students;

3. specific dollar amounts expended by individual universities–exclusive of government or private grants–to initiate and support compensatory or other programs for disadvantaged students;
4. methods that have been successful in identifying, recruiting, and educating deprived students with poor educational backgrounds;
5. federally funded programs for disadvantaged high-risk students that involve cooperation between the university and the community;
6. policies or practices designed to include high-risk students in campus activities other than remedial programs, and the effect, if any, of such inclusion on academic performance, attitudinal and learning patterns, and work habits;
7. programs to assimilate predominantly Negro colleges and universities into the mainstream of higher education in terms of integration and improving the quality of faculty, student performance, and facilities;
8. Attitudes of university subgroups, particularly other students and faculty toward high-risk minority students and the effect, if any, of such attitudes on the minority students' success or failure.

Wilma D. Monlouis

FOOTNOTES

[1]John Egerton, "Higher Education for 'High Risk' Students." Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Education Foundation, April 1968. 60p. ED 023 745. MF-$0.50, HC-$3.10.

[2]Edmund W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged, Programs and Practices: Preschool Through College." New York, New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966. 309p. ED 011 274. MF-$1.25, HC-$15.55.

[3]Florence B. Freedman and Florence C. Myers, "The College Discovery and Development Program: Disadvantaged Youth Prepare for College." *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors*, Vol. 32, no. 2 (Winter 1969).

[4]*New York College Bound Corporation and College Bound Program. Annual Report 1967-1968.* Brooklyn, New York: New York City Board of Education, April 1969. 43p. ED 031 994. MF-$0.25, HC-$2.25.

[5]*The Disadvantaged Student. Special Collegiate Programs: Admission, Financial Aid, Instruction.* New York, New York: The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Inc., November 1968. 158p. ED 030 378. MF-$0.75, HC-$8.00.

[6]Robert L. Williams, "What Are We Learning From Current University Programs for Disadvantaged Students?" Knoxville, Tennessee, University of Tennessee, November 1968. 34p. ED 024 342. MF-$0.25, HC-$1.80.

[7]Edmund W. Gordon, "The Higher Education of the Disadvantaged." Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, April 1967. 92p. ED 013 350. MF-$0.50, HC-$4.70.

[8]Albert N. Whiting, "General University Obligations to the Disadvantaged Student." Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, November 1968. 12p. ED 024 341. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.70.

[9]Edmund W. Gordon and Charles L. Thomas, "Brief: A Study on Compensatory Collegiate Programs for Minority Group Youth." New York, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1969. 16p. ED 028 746. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.90.

[10]Lawrence C. Howard, "Graduate Education for the 'Disadvantaged' and Black-Oriented University Graduates." Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S., December 1968. 15p. ED 026 022. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.85.

[11]Harold M. Stahmer, "The Harvard-Yale-Columbia Intensive Summer Studies Program. The Disadvantaged Student in Graduate School." December 1968. 13p. ED 026 020. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.75.

[12]Gordon and Wilkerson, *op. cit.*

[13]Donald Carlisle, "The Disadvantaged Student in Graduate School Master's and Doctoral Degree Programs in Predominantly Non-Negro Universities." Los Angeles, California: University of California, December 1968. 32p. ED 026 021. MF-$0.25, HC-$1.70.

[14]Preston Valien, "Undergraduate Educational Opportunity Programs." December 1968. 11p. ED 026 959. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.65.

[15]Ivan Hinderaker, "The University and Race Relations." Riverside, California: University of California, January 1969. 15p. ED 029 558. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.85.

Abstracts of documents processed in the ERIC system may be found in RESEARCH IN EDUCATION (RIE), a publication of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. RIE may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 for $1.75 per single copy or $21.00 for an annual subscription of 12 issues. All entries listed by ED (ERIC Document) are available in microfiche (MF) or hardcopy (HC) from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. Payment must accompany orders totaling less than $5.00 and must include a handling charge of $0.50 plus state sales tax where applicable.

The Clearinghouse operates under contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

Carl J. Lange, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University
1 Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036